

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application into condition for allowance. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-59 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 27-30, and 56-59, which are independent, are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification, specifically at page 10, lines 14-18.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which the Applicant is entitled.

II. TELEPHONE INTERVIEW

Applicant thanks the Examiner for holding a telephone interview with Applicant's representative on December 7, 2010, summarized herewith. The basic operation of the invention was explained. Distinctions of claim 1 over references were discussed. No agreement was reached.

III. SUPPORT FOR THIS AMENDMENT

Citations to Figures and Specification locations are provided. However, such citations are provided merely as examples and are not intended to limit the interpretation of the claims or to evidence or create any estoppel.

As an example, support of the amendment can be found at page 10, lines 14-18 of the Specification, which is reproduced as follows:

Page 10, lines 14-18,

The user system sends a service request to the server, block 305. The user causes the user system to send the request. **In some situations, the user system or server may create multiple service requests from a single request by a user. The service request indicates the user's identification information and a type of service.** In one implementation, the service request also indicates subscription information for the user.

IV. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0243665 to Markki, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Markki") in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0056093 to Huitema, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Huitema") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,758,746 to Hunter, et al. (hereinafter, merely "Hunter") and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 20050044048 to Zmudzinski et al. (hereinafter, merely "Zmudzinski") and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0031052 to Wannamaker et al. (hereinafter, merely "Wannamaker").

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

wherein after a predetermined number of services is requested through the link between the first account and the second account, the link between the first account and the second account is terminated,

wherein a service request includes identification information of the second user, subscription information of the second user, and a type of a requested service. (Emphasis added)

The Office Action (see page 2 and page 7) concedes that Huitema and Hunter do not disclose or render predictable the above-identified features of claim 1 and relies on a combination of Markki, Zmudzinski, and Wannamaker to reject “**wherein after a predetermined number of services is requested through the link between the first account and the second account, the link between the first account and the second account is terminated,**” as recited in claim 1. Specifically, the Office Action (see page 6) combines the teachings in paragraph [0134] of Markki, paragraphs [0008]-[0028] of Zmudzinski, and paragraphs [0148]-[0156] of Wannamaker to reject the above-identified features of claim 1. The Office Action asserts that:

- a. Paragraph [0134] of Markki teaches “group rules”;
- b. Paragraphs [0008]-[00028] of Zmudzinski teach “limiting a number of shareable licenses and at will termination”;
- c. Paragraphs [0148]-[0156] of Wannamaker teach “termination based on a level of service”; and
- d. It is obvious for a person of ordinary skill in the art would combine Markki, Zmudzinski, and Wannamaker to know the above-identified features of claim

1 in order to “insure that the level of supportable paid for services among all game users does not exceed the system’s capability to support those services.”

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the assertions in the Office Action.

Firstly, Applicant submits that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based on improper hindsight reasoning. The mere fact that the Office Action combines three references to reject one limitation in claim 1 provides strong evidence that the Office Action made the rejection guided by the teaching of the limitation itself. The combination of Markki, Zmudzinski, and Wannamaker cannot be done without knowledge gleaned only from Applicant's disclosure. The “group rules” of Markki is applied during a group creation in a peer-to-peer environment. The “termination of service” of Wannamaker is applied for a cable television when a process on a server such as a software program consumes too much memory. Clearly, Wannamaker solves a problem different in a field with no relation to Markki. Also, the method required by Wannamaker such as monitoring memory consumption need substantial modification when it is applied to “group rules” during group creation , which seems to have little concerns about memory consumption. Applicant submits that without the teaching of Applicant’s disclosure, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not incorporate Wannamaker into Markki.

Secondl y, claim 1 recites, **“wherein after a predetermined number of services is requested through the link between the first account and the second account, the link between the first account and the second account is terminated.”** Applicant submits that as long as “a predetermined number of services is requested through the link,” the link is terminated. Such a requesting of service may not ensure a “memory consumption” of the requested service.

For example, a request of service may be accepted or rejected. In contrast, Wannamaker does not disclose requesting a service, but Wannamaker monitors a “memory consumption of a service” after a request is granted. Therefore, the teaching of Wannamaker combined with Markki and Zmudzinski fail to disclose or render predictable the above-identified features of claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that Huitema, Hunter, Markki, Zmudzinski, and Wannamaker, taken either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or render predictable “**wherein a service request includes identification information of the second user, subscription information of the second user, and a type of a requested service,**” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable.

For similar reasons as those described above, claims 27-30 and 56-59 are also patentable.

As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified deficiencies, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

V. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. As nothing in the prior art cited in the Office Action cures the above-identified deficiencies, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections. As each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however,

the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Because Applicant maintains that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited reference, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference providing the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicant respectfully requests early passage to issue of the present application.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any
overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

By 
Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800